arXiv:1412.7425v1 [cond-mat.mes-hall] 23 Dec 2014

Exciton-photon correlations in bosonic condensates of exciton-polaritons

A. V. Kavokin,[1,2,3] A. S. Sheremet,[1,4] I. A. Shelykh,[5,6] P. G. Lagoudakis,[3] and Y. G. Rubo[7]

[1]*Russian Quantum Center, Novaya 100, 143025 Skolkovo, Moscow Region, Russia*
[2]*Spin Optics Laboratory, St.-Petersburg State University, 198504, Peterhof, St.-Petersburg, Russia*
[3]*School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, SO17 1NJ Southampton, United Kingdom*
[4]*Department of Theoretical Physics, St-Petersburg State Polytechnic University, 195251, St.-Petersburg, Russia*
[5]*Science Institute, University of Iceland, Dunhagi-3, IS-107, Reykjavik, Iceland*
[6]*Division of Physics and Applied Physics, Nanyang Technological University, 637371, Singapore*
[7]*Instituto de Energías Renovables, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Temixco, Morelos, 62580, Mexico*

(Dated: December 22, 2014)

Exciton-polaritons are mixed light-matter quasiparticles. We have developed a statistical model describing stochastic exciton-photon transitions within a condensate of exciton polaritons. We show that the exciton-photon correlator depends on the "hidden variable" which characterizes the rate of exciton-photon transformations in the condensate. We discuss implications of this effect for the quantum statistics of photons emitted by polariton lasers.

Introduction.—A pulse of light entering a crystal in the vicinity of the exciton resonance excites combined light-matter waves, as it was discovered by Pekar in 1957 [1]. Quantization of these waves yields mixed light-matter quasiparticles, currently known as exciton-polaritons. A classical theory developed by Hopfield in 1960s describes this process characterizing crystals by modified dielectric functions having resonant features [2]. The quantum theory developed by Agranovich [3] considers a polariton as a chain of virtual emission-absorption acts: a photon is absorbed creating an exciton, then an exciton recombines emitting a photon, etc. It is usually assumed that neither emission nor absorption of photons by excitons does take place in reality: photons entering a crystal are immediately transformed into exciton-photon quasiparticles which may be detected as excitons or as photons with certain probabilities given by so-called Hopfield coefficients. It is impossible to know a priori if an exciton-polariton would collapse to exciton or a photon state in each particular measurement.

The interpretation of exciton-polaritons as superposition light-matter quantum states is essential for understanding of the phenomenon of polariton lasing [4]. In polariton lasers, stimulated scattering of exciton-polaritons in semiconductor microcavities [5] leads to macroscopic population of a single quantum state, which forms a condensate (or Bose-Einstein condensate[6, 7]) of exciton-polaritons. A polariton condensate spontaneously emits the monochromatic and coherent light, which constitutes the polariton lasing effect [4, 8]. Polariton lasers have been experimentally realized in various semiconductor systems [9–12] and operate up to room temperature[13, 14]. From the point of view of the quantum theory[15], spontaneous emission of each individual photon does not collapse the many-body wave-function of the polariton condensate, which opens room for studying the internal structure of this mixed-light matter many-body state by measuring the statistics of emitted photons [16–18].

Here we present the model of exciton-polariton system describing both coherent and stochastic transformations of excitons and photons. Coherent processes are characterized by the Rabi frequency Ω, i.e., the splitting of upper and lower exciton-polariton eigenmodes, while the acts of stochastic conversion happen with a characteristic time τ_{xc}. These stochastic conversions are necessarily present in the weak exciton-light coupling regime. We assume, that they may also be present in some extent in the strong coupling regime, in which case the exciton-photon conversion rate constitutes a kind of "hidden parameter" of the system. In order to reveal the role of this hidden parameter in the noise spectra of photoluminescence and photocurrent generated by exciton-polaritons, one can place a condensate of exciton polaritons in a biased semiconductor microcavity structure[19], where polaritons can decay as excitons by electron and hole tunneling through the barriers or as photons by photon tunneling through dielectric mirrors of the microcavity thus contributing to the photoluminescence signal. We quantitatively analyze the correlations between the noises in exciton and photon decay channels as functions of the stochastic exciton-photon and photon-exciton conversion rate τ_{xc}^{-1}. We discuss the potential impact of the stochastic processes on the second order coherence in the emission of polariton lasers and compare the results of our statistical model with the experimental data by Kasprzak *et al.* [20].

Basic equations.—The strong exciton-photon coupling regime in microcavities manifests itself in the appearance of a Rabi doublet composed by lower (LP) and upper polariton (UP) branches. The lower $|LP\rangle$ and upper $|UP\rangle$ single-polariton states can be represented as

$$|LP\rangle = C_x\,|X\rangle - C_c\,|C\rangle\,, \quad |UP\rangle = C_c\,|X\rangle + C_x\,|C\rangle\,, \tag{1}$$

where $|X\rangle$ and $|C\rangle$ denote the exciton and cavity quantum states, respectively. The Hopfield coefficients are given by $C_{x,c} = 2^{-1/2}(1 \pm \Delta/\sqrt{4\Omega^2+\Delta^2})^{1/2}$ with Δ being the detuning between the bare photon and exciton

mode [5]. In the following we shall restrict ourselves to the simplest $\Delta = 0$ case.

The system of exciton-polaritons is described by the density matrix $\hat{\rho}$, which evolves according to the equation

$$\frac{d\hat{\rho}(t)}{dt} = \frac{i}{\hbar}[\hat{\rho}, \hat{H}_0] - \frac{1}{2}\sum_j \frac{1}{\tau_j}\left(\hat{A}_j^\dagger \hat{A}_j \hat{\rho} + \hat{\rho}\hat{A}_j^\dagger \hat{A}_j - 2\hat{A}_j \hat{\rho} \hat{A}_j^\dagger\right). \quad (2)$$

Here we assume that exciton-polaritons are excited at $t = 0$ and all decay processes are present only at $t > 0$. The decay processes under consideration are described by four Lindblad terms with $j = x, c, xc, cx$. Denoting by $\hat{a}^\dagger$ ($\hat{a}$) and $\hat{b}^\dagger$ ($\hat{b}$) the creation (annihilation) operators for excitons and photons, respectively, we describe the escape (annihilation) of an exciton with the operator $\hat{A}_x = \hat{a}$ and the characteristic life-time τ_x, the escape of a photon is described with $\hat{A}_c = \hat{b}$ and the life-time τ_c. The two processes of conversion are present: the exciton-to-photon conversion with $\hat{A}_{xc} = \hat{b}^\dagger \hat{a}$ and the photon-to-exciton conversion with $\hat{A}_{cx} = \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{b}$, both having the same characteristic conversion time τ_{xc}. The equation for the density matrix is completed by the term describing the coherent exciton-photon coupling with

$$\hat{H}_0 = \Omega(\hat{a}^\dagger \hat{b} + \hat{b}^\dagger \hat{a}). \quad (3)$$

Stochastic exciton-photon conversion makes evolution of $\hat{\rho}$ to be quite complex, as it can be seen from the Glauber-Sudarshan representation of Eq. (2). Expanding of $\hat{\rho}$ on the basis of coherent states $|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}\rangle$, where $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ are 2D vectors such that $\hat{a}\,|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}\rangle = (x_1 + \mathrm{i}x_2)\,|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}\rangle$ and $\hat{b}\,|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}\rangle = (y_1 + \mathrm{i}y_2)\,|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}\rangle$, one can obtain

$$\hat{\rho} = \int d^2x\, d^2y\, p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, t)\,|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}\rangle\,\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}|\,, \quad (4)$$

$$\frac{\partial p}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{2\tau_x}(\boldsymbol{\nabla}_x \cdot \mathbf{x})p + \frac{1}{2\tau_c}(\boldsymbol{\nabla}_y \cdot \mathbf{y})p + \Omega\hat{\mathcal{C}}p + \frac{1}{4\tau_{xc}}(\hat{\mathcal{C}}^2 + \hat{\mathcal{D}}^2)p. \quad (5)$$

Here operator

$$\hat{\mathcal{C}} = [\mathbf{x} \times \boldsymbol{\nabla}_y] + [\mathbf{y} \times \boldsymbol{\nabla}_x] \quad (6)$$

describes the Rabi oscillation in the system, while

$$\hat{\mathcal{D}} = (\mathbf{x} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla}_y) - (\mathbf{y} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla}_x) \quad (7)$$

governs the stochastic mixing between exciton and photon subsystems.

The effect of conversion can be analyzed in the limiting case $\tau_x, \tau_c \gg \tau_{xc}$, where the first two terms in the right-hand-side of (5) can be omitted. The remaining Fokker-Planck equation conserves the average number of particles $N = \int d^2x\, d^2y\, (\mathbf{x}^2 + \mathbf{y}^2)p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, t)$, having in mind that $\hat{\mathcal{C}}\mathbf{x}^2 + \hat{\mathcal{C}}\mathbf{y}^2 = \hat{\mathcal{D}}\mathbf{x}^2 + \hat{\mathcal{D}}\mathbf{y}^2 = 0$. Moreover, any function $p(\mathbf{x}^2 + \mathbf{y}^2)$ represents a time-independent solution. The system evolves to reach the state that corresponds to the equidistribution of exciton and photons, what also implies the equidistribution between upper and lower polariton branches.

The operators $\hat{\mathcal{C}}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ obey the following useful relations: $\hat{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{x}\cdot\mathbf{y}) = 0$, $\hat{\mathcal{D}}^2(\mathbf{x}\cdot\mathbf{y}) = -4(\mathbf{x}\cdot\mathbf{y})$. These relations can be used to obtain the time-dependence of the total energy of the system $E(t) = 2\Omega \int d^2x\, d^2y\, (\mathbf{x}\cdot\mathbf{y})p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, t)$, which decays exponentially to zero, which corresponds to the bare exciton (photon) energy in our notation, $E(t) \propto \exp(-t/\tau_E)$, with

$$\frac{1}{\tau_E} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{\tau_x} + \frac{1}{\tau_c}\right) + \frac{1}{\tau_{xc}}. \quad (8)$$

We note that for finite $\tau_{x,c}$ the average number of particles also decays exponentially, $N(t) \propto \exp(-t/\tau_N)$, but on a different time scale

$$\frac{1}{\tau_N} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{\tau_x} + \frac{1}{\tau_c}\right). \quad (9)$$

As a result, the stochastic conversion strongly affects the energy per particle E/N, which is otherwise time-independent for $\tau_{xc} = 0$ [see the insets in Fig. 2(a) below].

In what follows, several correlators of interest will be defined by the diagonal elements of the density matrix $P(n_a, n_b, t)$ in the basis of exciton and photon number states, which describe the probabilities to have n_a excitons and n_b photons in the system. The dynamics of $P(n_a, n_b, t)$ is found from (2) to be

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dP(n_a, n_b)}{dt} &= \tau_x^{-1}[(n_a+1)P(n_a+1, n_b) - n_a P(n_a, n_b)] \\ &+\tau_c^{-1}[(n_b+1)P(n_a, n_b+1) - n_b P(n_a, n_b)] \\ &+\tau_{xc}^{-1}[(n_a+1)n_b P(n_a+1, n_b-1) - n_a(n_b+1)P(n_a, n_b)] \\ &+\tau_{xc}^{-1}[(n_b+1)n_a P(n_a-1, n_b+1) - (n_a+1)n_b P(n_a, n_b)],\end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where the sum of its diagonal elements is normalized to unity $\sum_{n_a, n_b} P(n_a, n_b, t) = 1$.

Exciton-photon correlations.—The quantities of interest to be analyzed in the remaining part of this Letter include the exciton-photon correlator

$$g_{xc}(t) = \frac{\langle n_a(t) n_b(t)\rangle}{\langle n_a(t)\rangle \langle n_b(t)\rangle}, \quad (11)$$

the exciton and photon second-order coherence

$$g_{2x}(t) = \frac{\langle n_a(t)^2 - n_a(t)\rangle}{\langle n_a(t)\rangle^2}, \quad g_{2c}(t) = \frac{\langle n_b(t)^2 - n_b(t)\rangle}{\langle n_b(t)\rangle^2} \quad (12)$$

and the generalized exciton-photon correlator expressed through the previous three correlators

$$G_{xc}(t) = \frac{g_{xc}^2}{g_{2x} g_{2c}} = \frac{\langle n_a(t) n_b(t) \rangle^2}{\langle n_a(t)^2 - n_a(t) \rangle \langle n_b(t)^2 - n_b(t) \rangle}. \tag{13}$$

The latter correlator is convenient since $G_{xc} = 1$ for a polariton condensate formed at the low-polariton branch independently of the statistics of particles within the condensate. To prove this statement, we express the exciton and photon operators through the polaritons operators corresponding to the lower and the upper branches, $\hat{c}_L = (\hat{a} - \hat{b})/\sqrt{2}$ and $\hat{c}_U = (\hat{a} + \hat{b})/\sqrt{2}$, respectively. Assuming that the upper polariton branch is empty, we obtain

$$G_{xc} = \frac{\langle \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{b}^\dagger a b \rangle^2}{\langle \hat{a}^{\dagger 2} \hat{a}^2 \rangle \langle \hat{b}^{\dagger 2} \hat{b}^2 \rangle} = \frac{\langle \hat{c}_L^{\dagger 2} \hat{c}_L^2 \rangle^2}{\langle c_L^{\dagger 2} c_L^2 \rangle \langle \hat{c}_L^{\dagger 2} \hat{c}_L^2 \rangle} = 1. \tag{14}$$

As we discussed above, the stochastic exciton-photon conversion leads to the mixing of lower and upper polariton branches, and this is indicated by deviation of G_{xc} from unity. We consider coherent and Fock states of polaritons at the lower polariton branch as initial states of our system. The initial diagonal elements of the density matrix for the coherent state can be described by the product of two Poisson distributions

$$P(n_a, n_b, 0) = \frac{e^{-N}}{n_a!\, n_b!} \left(\frac{N}{2} \right)^{n_a + n_b}, \tag{15}$$

while for the Fock state they are given by

$$P(n_a, n_b, 0) = \frac{1}{2^N} \frac{N!}{n_a! n_b!}, \tag{16}$$

where N is the average number of the lower-branch polaritons at $t = 0$.

Figure 1 shows the time evolution of the correlators $G_{xc}(t)$, $g_{xc}(t)$, $g_{2x}(t)$, and $g_{2c}(t)$, calculated assuming infinite exciton and photon lifetimes. As expected for the initial coherent state, $g_{xc}(0) = g_{2x}(0) = g_{2c}(0) = G_{xc}(0) = 1$. The subsequent change of all considered correlators is substantial and experimentally verifiable. On the time scale of τ_{xc} the correlators approach their saturation values,

$$g_{xc} \to \frac{2}{3}, \tag{17a}$$

$$g_{2x},\, g_{2c} \to \frac{4}{3}, \tag{17b}$$

$$G_{xc} \to \frac{1}{4}. \tag{17c}$$

These saturations values (17a-c) are quasiclassical and can be obtained using the equidistribution of particles,



FIG. 1. (Color online) The time evolution of the correlators $G_{xc}(t)$ (black), $g_{xc}(t)$ (blue) and $g_{2x}(t) = g_{2c}(t)$ (red). There is initially $N(0) = 10$ lower-branch polaritons in the coherent (solid lines) and and the Fock (dashed lines) states (see text). Infinite lifetimes of excitons and photons $\tau_x = \tau_c = \infty$ are assumed.

i.e., using the density matrix (4) with the kernel p depending on $\mathbf{x}^2 + \mathbf{y}^2$ only. There are quantum corrections to the expressions (17a-c) where the kernel $p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is a non-positive and singular function. Consider, e.g., the evolution of the initial Fock state of N polaritons in the simplest case of infinite exciton and photon lifetimes. The stochastic mixing process equalizes the probabilities of all possible combinations of n_a and n_b such as $n_a + n_b = N$. Namely,

$$P(n_a, n_b, t \to \infty) = \frac{1}{N+1} \delta_{n_a + n_b, N}. \tag{18}$$

As a result, for $t \to \infty$ we have $\langle n_{a,b} \rangle = N/2$, $\langle n_{a,b}^2 \rangle = N(2N+1)/6$, $\langle n_a n_b \rangle = N(N-1)/6$, so that the factor $(1 - N^{-1})$ appears in the right-hand-sides of the expressions (17a,b).

In Figure 2 we demonstrate the behaviour of several diagonal elements $P(n_a, n_b, t)$ of the density matrix as functions of time for the initial coherent distribution (15) and realistic exciton and photon lifetimes. In the panel (a) we account for the finite stochastic exciton-photon conversion time, while in the panel (b) the stochastic conversion is neglected. In the absence of stochastic processes there is an asymmetry in the behaviour of the density matrix elements $P(n_a, n_b, t)$ corresponding to the same number of polaritons $N = n_a + n_b$, which is caused by the difference of exciton and photon lifetimes. The stochastic process affects noticeably this behavior, as it is seen in Fig. 2(a). Due to the transformations of photons to excitons and vice versa, the density matrix elements $P(n_a, n_b, t) \approx P(n_b, n_a, t)$ if $t > \tau_{xc}$. The insets in Figs. 2(a,b) show the calculated energy per particle. As expected, this energy exponentially tends to zero on the timescale of τ_{xc} [inset in Fig. 2(a)], while it is constant in



FIG. 2. (Color online) Showing evolution of some diagonal elements $P(n_a, n_b, t)$, as well as evolution of the average number of particles N and the energy per particle on insets. The panel (a) corresponds to the finite time of the exciton-photon conversion $\tau_{xc} = 5\,\text{ps}$, while the behavior in the absence of stochastic conversion is shown in the panel (b). The polariton condensate is initially in the coherent state with $N = 10$. The life-times of excitons and photons are $\tau_x = 40\,\text{ps}$ and $\tau_c = 10\,\text{ps}$.

the absence of the stochastic mixing [inset in Fig. 2(b)).

It is seen that the pronounced variations of the quantum coherence, exciton-photon correlators and the energy-per-particle with time may be observed if $\tau_{xc} < \tau_x, \tau_c$. How short can be the exciton-photon conversion time τ_{xc} in realistic structures? Clearly, in the strong coupling regime one requires $\tau_{xc} > \Omega^{-1}$, otherwise the polariton Rabi-oscillations [22, 23, 25, 26] would not be observed in time-resolved optical spectroscopy experiments. Most likely, τ_{xc} should be of the order of the decoherence time of Rabi oscillations (typically, 3-10 ps), which can still be short compared to the polariton lifetime. The most direct way to prove the existence of stochastic exciton-photon conversions in polariton condensates would be through the measurement of the generalized exciton-photon correlator (13). Deviation of this correlator from 1 would be a signature of the stochastic process described here. However, the experimental detection of correlations between photocurrent and photoluminescence is a challenging task. A simpler experiment would consist in simultaneous measurements of the noise in Kerr rotation angle of a linearly polarized probe pulse and the noise in the photoluminescence of a polariton condensate excited by a circularly polarized pump pulse. Indeed, the Kerr rotation angle is proportional to the exciton fraction of the polariton condensate [25], while the photoluminescence signal is proportional to its photonic fraction.

Note, that the stochastic exciton-photon conversion might be responsible for the increase of the second order coherence function $g_2(0)$ above the polariton lasing threshold in the experiments of Kasprzak *et al.* [20]. The experimental $g_2(0)$ increases even beyond the predicted by our model limit of 4/3. This may be a consequence of other mechanisms of decoherence, e.g. polariton-polariton scattering and interaction with bi-excitons.

Finally, while in this Letter we have specifically considered an initial coherent state of the polariton condensate, which is the most natural choice for polariton lasers, and only confronted it to the exotic Fock state limit, our theory can be easily extended to any other statistics of the initial state (e.g., the thermal statistics). Our goal is to show that the stochastic conversion of excitons into photons and vice versa should have strong influence upon the quantum optical properties of exciton-polariton condensates.

Acknowledgments.—We thank N. Gippius and O. Kibis for valuable discussions. This work was supported in part by EU IRSES projects POLAPHEN and LIMACONA. AVK acknowledges the financial support from the EPSRC Established Career Fellowship RP008833. ASS acknowledges fellowship from the Russian President Program and RFBR project 13-02-00944. IAS acknowledges the support from EU ITN project NOTEDEV and Rannis project BOFEHYSS.

[1] S. I. Pekar, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **33**, 1022 (1957) [Sov. Phys. JETP**6**, 785 (1958)].
[2] J.J. Hopfield, Phys. Rev., **112**, 1555 (1958).
[3] V.M. Agranovich, Optika i Spectr., **3**, 84, (1957).
[4] A. Imamoglu, R.J. Ram, S. Pau, and Y. Yamamoto, Phys. Rev. A, **53**, 4250 (1996).
[5] for general properties of cavity polaritons, see e.g. A. Kavokin, J.J. Baumberg, G. Malpuech, and F.P. Laussy, *Microcavities* (Oxford University Press, 2007).
[6] For review on polariton BEC see e.g. H. Deng, H. Haug, and Y. Yamamoto Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 1489 (2010) and references therein.
[7] The difference between polariton lasing and Bose-Einstein condensation is discussed e.g. in L. V. Butov and A. V. Kavokin, The behavior of exciton-polaritons, Nature Photonics, **6**, 2 (2012).
[8] D. Porras, C. Ciuti, J. J. Baumberg, and C. Tejedor, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 085304 (2002).
[9] J. Kasprzak, M. Richard, S. Kundermann, A. Baas, P. Jeambrun, J. M. J. Keeling, F.M. Marchetti, M.H. Szymanska, R. Andre, J.L. Staehli, V. Savona, P.B. Littlewood, B. Deveaud and Le Si Dang, Nature **443**, 409 (2006).

[10] R. Balili, V. Hartwell, D. Snoke, L. Pfeiffer, and K. West, Science **316**, 1007 (2007).

[11] D. Bajoni, P. Senellart, E. Wertz, I. Sagnes, A. Miard, A. Lemaître, and J. Bloch Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 047401 (2008).

[12] C. Schneider, A. Rahimi-Iman, N.Y. Kim, J. Fischer, I. G. Savenko, M. Amthor, M. Lermer, A. Wolf, L. Worschech, V. D. Kulakovskii, I. A. Shelykh, M. Kamp, S. Reitzenstein, A. Forchel, Y. Yamamoto, and S. Höfling, Nature **497**, 348 (2013).

[13] D.G. Lidzey, D.D.C. Bradley, T. Virgili, A. Armitage, M.S. Skolnick, and S. Walker Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 3316 (1999).

[14] S. Christopoulos, G. Baldassarri Höger von Högersthal, A. Grundy, P.G. Lagoudakis, A.V. Kavokin, J.J. Baumberg, G. Christmann, R. Butté, E. Feltin, J.-F. Carlin, and N. Grandjean, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 126405 (2007).

[15] F. P. Laussy *Quantum Dynamics of Polariton Condensates* in *Exciton Polaritons in Microcavities* ed. by V. Timofeev, D. Sanvitto (Springer, 2012).

[16] H. Deng, G. Weihs, C. Santori, J. Bloch, and Y. Yamamoto, Science **298**, 199 (2002).

[17] P. Schwendimann and A. Quattropani, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 085317 (2008).

[18] T. Horikiri, P. Schwendimann, A. Quattropani, S. Höfling, A. Forchel, and Y. Yamamoto Phys. Rev. B **81**, 033307 (2010).

[19] P. Tsotsis, S. I. Tsintzos, G. Christmann, P.G. Lagoudakis, O. Kyriienko, I.A. Shelykh, J.J. Baumberg, A.V. Kavokin, Z. Hatzopoulos, P.S. Eldridge and P. G. Savvidis, Phys. Rev. Applied **2**, 014002 (2014).

[20] J. Kasprzak, M. Richard, A. Baas, B. Deveaud, R. André, J.-Ph. Poizat, and Le Si Dang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 067402 (2008).

[21] C.W. Gardiner and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. A **55**, 2902 (1997).

[22] T.B. Norris, J.K. Rhee, C. Y. Sung, Y. Arakawa, M. Nishioka, & C. Weisbuch, Phys. Rev. B, **50**, 14663 (1994).

[23] J.D. Berger, O. Lyngnes, H.M. Gibbs, G. Khitrova, T.R. Nelson, E.K. Lindmark, A.V. Kavokin, M.A. Kaliteevski, and V.V. Zapasskii, Phys. Rev. B 54, 1975 (1996).

[24] S. Jiang, S. Machida, Y. Takiguchi, Y. Yamamoto, and H. Cao, Appl. Phys. Lett. **73**, 3031 (1998).

[25] A. Brunetti, M. Vladimirova, D. Scalbert, M. Nawrocki, A.V. Kavokin, I. A. Shelykh, and J. Bloch, Phys. Rev. B **74**, 241101 (2006).

[26] L. Dominici, D. Colas, S. Donati, J. P. Restrepo Cuartas, M. De Giorgi, D. Ballarini, G. Guirales, J. C. López Carreño, A. Bramati, G. Gigli, E. del Valle, F. P. Laussy, & D. Sanvitto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 226401 (2014).